DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 712 UD 010 665

AUTHOR	Stagner, Ross
TITLE	Psychological Dynamics of Inner-City Problems. Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program.
INSTITUTION	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	38p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00
DESCRIPTORS	Aspiration, Black Community, Black Power, *City Problems, Hostility, *Inner City, *Perception, *Policy Formation, *Psychological Characteristics, Psychological Needs, Self Actualization, Self Concept, Self Esteem, Violence, Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This report is one in a series of proceedings of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program sponsored by the Manpower Administration. It is argued that psychologists can make their greatest contribution to solving the problems of the inner city not by helping to write the various commission reports following outbreaks of civil violence but by attempting to understand why the recommendations of such commissions are commonly disregarded. The key to a psychological understanding of this self-destructuve policy that American society is carrying out lies in our failure to achieve a realistic perception of the nature of the problems with which society is faced. The motivational key to many inner city hostilities is the intolerable gap between what residents of such areas desire and what they can achieve. What a man has to have is not a job per se, but a position in which he can respect himself and be respected by other people; economic productivity is not essential. In conclusion, if through psychology one can deal with the irrational factors blocking progress, rational changes can be introduced. (JM)

ED043712

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM

Psychological Dynamics of Inner-City Problems

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD010665

by ROSS STAGNER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Willard Wirtz, Secretary
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator

- This report is one in a series of proceedings of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program sponsored by the Manpower Administration. It presents a condensed transcript of the seminar held in Washington, D.C., March 14, 1968.
- The purpose of the seminars is to provide a platform for guest speakers and for members of the Department of Labor and other agencies concerned with manpower problems to discuss issues arising from the development of an active manpower policy.
- Expressions of opinion by the speaker, the moderator, and those participating from the audience are not to be construed as official opinions of the U.S. Government or the Department of Labor.

COVER: Original woodcut by Jacob Landau, commissioned for the collection of Limbach Construction.

OPENING REMARKS

William Mirengoff
Deputy Associate Manpower Administrator
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

MR. MIRENGOFF: This, Bob Behlow tells me, is the 39th in our series of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program conducted by the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. These seminars, as you know, provide an opportunity for the Department, guests, and members to engage in what I guess we now call dialogue. We used to talk to each other, but we don't talk anymore. We get dialogues. This is, I guess, a nature of a dialogue on social and economic issues now current. The seminar will be recorded and published and will be obtainable by writing to the Manpower Administration.

I must confess that although there have been 38 such seminars, I attended only the first one. But when I noticed this particular seminar, I made a very solemn vow to attend for two reasons. My first reason for attending is that I am convinced there is no more important problem facing this Nation than the problem of the inner city. I think it does threaten to unravel the social and political economic fabric of our structure, of our economy.

Secondly, I am quite convinced that there is no monolithic approach to the problem and that those of us who have become known as the manpower people do not by a long shot have the answer, and that we had better start talking or dialoguing with the psychologists, sociologists, educators, doctors, and so forth.

We are very fortunate this afternoon to have as Chairman for this session, Solomon E. Asch, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Institute for Cognitive Studies at Rutgers University. Professor Asch has a long and distinguished career, including positions at

Brooklyn College, Swarthmore College, the New School for Social Research, Harvard, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His list of publications and affiliations from which I have read is long enough to constitute a report in itself. The reference that I find most interesting in his background is the fact that he had been an assistant professor at Brooklyn College when I was a student there quite some time ago. Although I cannot recall running into him in class, we must have passed each other dodging trolley cars and automobiles on Avenue "H" in downtown Brooklyn, which then passed for our campus.

I am very pleased to introduce the Chairman for this afternoon, Prof. Solomon E. Asch.

Chairman—Solomon E. Asch, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Institute for Cognitive Studies at Rutgers University

DR. ASCH: Thank you. Coming here I was reminded of a remark William James once made. The most important question one can ask of another person, he stated, is one that a landlady put to a would-be boarder: "Young man," she said, "what is your philosophy?" Such landladies may now be extinct, but James' remark retains its point. He meant to say that despite appearances the question was a highly practical one. Looking at the speakers you have invited from a wide spectrum of disciplines—economists, sociologists, anthropologists, experts on cities—I see that those who conceived these seminars have in good part taken William James' admonition to heart. To be sure, you have not yet listened to a philosopher, but you have taken a step in the right direction by giving the floor today to a psychologist. I am convinced that such steps are necessary, and that the problem of the cities will be bungled if we will not also listen to historians, writers, and artists.

My reason is not that these disciplines have answers to the desperate problems of the cities. In any case, I do not believe that psychology has them; in this respect I am not quite as optimistic as

many of my colleagues. Indeed, there is in my opinion a certain danger in the expectation of ready solutions. At the same time there are important contributions that psychology can make, if for no other reason than that its practitioners are sensitized to certain human issues. At the least, they can contribute ways of thinking and the clarification of problems.

Thinking about the speaker today, my mind went back to the middle 1930's, when I was beginning in psychology and was attending a meeting of the American Psychological Association. This was in the depths of the depression and I had wandered one evening into the business session where a discussion was going on over a resolution to do something about the devastating unemployment of psychologists. The speaker, a well-known scientist and elder statesman, claimed that a scientific society should not concern itself with questions of unemployment. But he could not forebear to add that it is not for psychologists to tamper with the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, an argument not particularly unusual in those days. When he sat down, up stood a young man. I unfortunately no longer remember what the young man said, although I recall that he was quite cogent. What impressed me most about him, however, was the sense he conveyed of unsentimentality in the service of a conscience. This young Turk is now himself a distinguished psychologist and our speaker; I do not know if he will allow me to call him an elder statesman.

Over the years there has been a clear thread of consistency in the thought and work of Professor Stagner, not wholly unconnected with the incident I just described. He has taken to himself a problem which belongs at the very center of psychology: a concern with what philosophers call the difference between "appearance and reality." The appearances of things, persons, and actions—the way they look and feel to us—are important not only because they exist; they determine what we believe, and consequently, how we act in the real world. In this sense appearances have a compelling reality. Appearances have another peculiar quality: they are often misleading, but they look right to their owners.

No matter how well-intentioned we may be, the appearances that control our actions have consequences independent of our desires. When appearances contradict what is actually the case, we speak, of course, of distortions and delusions. When appearances go wrong in

the social field, they generate tensions and hostilities. It is from this vantage point that Professor Stagner has studied a number of basic social problems—the psychological conditions of nationalism, of industrial conflict, and of international conflict. These have been for him questions of high scientific import, but their human implications are equally clear. He has, in short, been concerned with the conditions of misunderstanding in the social world, and with the possibilities for overcoming misunderstandings. He has therefore had to pay close attention to the "dialogues of the deaf," of those who do not communicate with each other.

We shall now hear how Professor Stagner applies his thinking to what is euphemistically called the inner city. Professor Stagner is the author of many books and scientific papers. The author of "A General Introduction to Psychology," he has also written works on the psychology of human conflict and industrial conflict, and he has been closely concerned with union-management relations. Now Chairman of the Department of Psychology at Wayne State University, he has previously taught at the University of Illinois and at Dartmouth College. He was the President of the Division of Personality and Social Psychology of the American Psychological Association and Fulbright lecturer at the University of Rome and the London School of Economics.

I am very pleased to introduce Prof. Ross Stagner.

Psychological Dynamics of Inner-City Problems

An Address by Dr. Ross Stagner

DR. STAGNER: Thank you, Dr. Asch. I was amused that you remembered that incident. I think it was 1935. I gave the dean of whom you were speaking quite a lecture on the subject of the ethical responsibilities of psychologists. I got some applause from some people and some boos from others. But I have been lecturing people ever since. Most people don't listen, of course. After you have taught college students for 35 or 40 years, you come to the conclusion that it's impossible to teach anybody anything anyway.

I was indeed a little uncertain as to whether I should accept the invitation to come here this afternoon, having expressed these pessimistic views, but my good sense got the better of me, and so I accepted this invitation. I was not quite certain just what role, what aspect of this problem, I should address myself to.

The solutions to the problems of the inner city are quite clear. They have been set forth by many experts: economists, sociologists, and educators. They were stated in the report of the White House Conference on Civil Rights in June 1966. They were set forth in the report of the McCone Commission in California, also issued in 1966, and the report of the Kerner Commission in 1968. They undoubtedly will be restated in the reports next year by the commission to investigate this year's riots. And then in 1970 they can be restated in the report on the 1969 riots, and so forth.

The one thing we can see clearly about these reports is that the experts agree with each other. There is nothing wrong with the in-

ner city which cannot be corrected by more and better jobs, housing, and education. In other words, there isn't any real need for psychologists to participate in this discussion if we are concerned only with the question: What is the correct solution?

The Problem of Irrational Behavior

There is, however, a contribution which I think psychologists can make, and that is to answer this question: Why doesn't anybody do anything about these reports? Why do we file them away and let them gather dust? In the meantime, we are buying tanks, Stoner rifles, and other kinds of deadly armaments for our police forces. Why is it that the majority of society in the United States persists in such a suicidal course of action? This is a psychological problem. So what I want to address myself to this afternoon is the question: Why do we act in such an irrational manner? Dr. Asch has, of course, given away in advance the point which I am going to emphasize, namely, that the key to a psychological understanding of this self-destructive policy that American society is carrying out lies in our failure to achieve a realistic perception of the nature of the problems with which we are faced.

I therefore want to start (and I apologize in advance to my friends in the audience who are professional psychologists) by saying some things which will seem rather elementary to psychologists. This seems proper because, as far as I have been informed, most of you are not professionals in this field. I hope that these remarks will be of interest and value to you.

Perceptions

With respect to any question on public policy, there are three questions a psychologist will ask. First: How will this policy be perceived by the different groups who are affected? That is to say, will the "reality" look the same to different individuals? And when the question is raised that way, you immediately recognize that it will not look the same. Each policy looks quite different to the different persons who are affected by it. So, for example, some of you are now concerned with the question: How is the State Employment

Service office perceived in the inner city? The answer is that a great many residents of the inner city do not even know there is such a thing as the Employment Service. Among those who know about it are a very considerable number who perceive it as having no earthly value as far as they are concerned. There are other people who perceive it as being useful. What I am saying is that the same object, the same policy proposal—let's say the respective functions of the Employment Service—may be perceived in quite varied ways by different individuals. In the evaluation of a policy proposal, therefore, we must take account of these differences in perception and attempt to implement a policy in such a way as to take account of these facts.

Motives

The second question is: Whose motives will be satisfied by this particular policy? To use the same example, we might ask: Will an expansion of the Employment Service satisfy the motives of the inner-city inhabitants, or will it satisfy the motives of the Employment Service staff? That is a very unkind way of putting it. I am sure I could think of some better way to say it. But this is just to make my point sharply.

Frustrations

The third policy or evaluative question that we would ask would be: Who will be frustrated by this policy or this proposal? Who will be angry? Who will be hostile to this particular approach? These are simple, obvious questions. Unfortunately they frequently are not considered, or if they are considered by staff members, they are neglected by the people implementing the policy.

Appearance and Reality

Let me go back now and take up each of these three questions in somewhat more detail. First, the question of perception. Dr. Asch called your attention to the fact that there is a difference between

appearance and *reality*. One of the difficulties we have in trying to implement social policy in this country is that everybody thinks he knows what the facts really are. The difficulty arises because each individual is sure that the facts as he knows them are the real facts, and other people (those who see things differently) are liars, fools, or knaves. This is undoubtedly sometimes true, but basically, the psychologist says, every perception is a purely subjective matter. You are never acquainted with reality in any direct sense of the word.

Let me ask: What is this table, really? You can say it's really a piece of furniture. But a botanist might say it's really a piece of pine with some walnut veneer over it. An organic chemist might say it's really a bunch of hydrocarbon molecules. A nuclear physicist could say it's really a bunch of electrons and protons. What is a table, really? It's all of these things, depending on how you look at it. This is what Einstein was saying, or rather, this is the application of the principle of relativity in the field of psychology—that every fact is relative to an observer. We do not know what reality is in an ultimate sense. We have perceptions of reality. Remember: We must act on the basis of our perceptions. We have no other basis for action except these perceptions. But these are always subject to error.

Let me take another example. You will never know another person. You will never know what this other person really is. You can be married for 30 or 40 years and at the end of that time you will not know what your mate really thinks about you. You know what he or she says, what his or her behavior is like, but you can never know with certainty what this person really thinks and feels. We never have direct knowledge of the realities of another person. We never have direct knowledge of the reality of any situation.

Suppose we examine the phenomena of the riots of last summer. Were they really blackmail? So many people have said, in the last few weeks, that the Kerner Commission report is recommending that we surrender to blackmail by the criminal element in our cities. Or was the riot a spontaneous revolt by people who have been oppressed? Or was it a conspiracy of Communists who are out to overthrow our society? Was it an inevitable consequence of the policies of the white majority? There are many different ways in which the riots can be perceived. What were the riots, really? They are all

of these things, depending on the observer, depending on the perceiver.

Reality is subjective, not objective. Each of these perceptions varies according to the individual concerned. This becomes a hopeless problem from the point of view of social policy because there are 200 million American citizens, and obviously we cannot go around and conduct public opinion polls to take account of all these different perceptions. But we can classify people in various ways and begin to get some notion of how these things break down in the population.

Groups in the Inner City

If we take, for example, the inhabitants of the inner city (and I take it that we are really using this as a euphemism for Negro populations in the cities), there are perhaps 5 percent of these individuals who are black militants. They are a small group of very aggressive individuals—very frustrated, very unhappy with the existing order of things. They perceive the riots as wonderful. They thought the riots were a very fine assertion of people's unwillingness to be trampled on, or people's willingness to demand better treatment from the majority society.

There is a much larger group of middle-class Negroes, perhaps 20 percent of the population, who have been fairly well assimilated into the majority culture. These people are, economically, reasonably secure. Their perception of the riots is that they were terrible, that they were shameful behavior, and that they showed childish destructiveness and suicidal behavior on the part of people in the ghettos.

Then we have the largest group of all, whom I characterize as the passive, dependent majority of the black population, who felt—from our observations in Detroit at least—that the riots were on the whole shameful, but maybe good. They had ambivalent feelings about the riots because they felt that this behavior was destructive of the property, lives, and creature comforts of black people. But they also felt that one can get a certain amount of ego satisfaction out of asserting himself even in the face of overwhelming odds.

Policy Varies With Perceptions

So we can start breaking down the perceiving population—the population of people who observe a particular situation—and try to classify them according to how this particular situation looks to them. From the point of view of social policy, we might ask questions like this:

1. Are we pushing the middle-class Negro into the arms of the black militant? Is the majority culture following policies which are pushing the successful Negro businessman, doctor, lawyer, or professional person into a hostile posture? This man has obeyed the middle-class rules. He defers his gratifications and gets his education. He lives quietly and cooperatively. He inhibits his aggressive impulses. But what kind of a reward does the majority culture offer him? He cannot move into the suburbs. He cannot get out where his kids will have grass to play on. He cannot get them into the good school systems. (He can send his children to private school if he is economically successful enough.) But basically, the white society—the majority society—is blocking him from achieving those particular goals which it has held up as the rewards for conforming to these middle-class rules. So I suspect that we are faced with a situation in which we may be actually creating additional leaders—intelligent, educated people who will go into the black militant structure and provide it with leadership—because we are not following an intelligent social policy of insuring availability of these goals to the middle-class Negro. This is alarming if for no other reason than this: Historians tell us that *successful* revolutions have been led by middle-class intellectuals.

2. Are we pushing the passive, dependent Negroes into the arms of the black militants? Here the average slumdweller—and I am talking primarily about the Negro slumdweller—is harrassed by criminals and by violence. Many of them have to pay protection money because the police do not give them protection. They have to pay to be protected from other slumdwellers. Why shouldn't they become militant? If they are not getting any benefits from society, perhaps the smart thing would be for them to become more aggressive and more militant, too.

What I am saying, in short, is that instead of recognizing the breakdown of this population into various subgroups, and trying to take account of the psychological characteristics of these groups, the

majority culture has fallen into a trap—into the error of treating this entire population as unified. There is a tendency—a very alarming tendency, nowadays—to speak about "we" and "they." There is a tendency, for example, to say, "The Negro community has a crime problem and they must do something about it." When Richard Speck killed eight nurses in Chicago, or when Charles Whitman climbed up to the university tower in Texas and killed 16 people, I did not hear anybody say, "The white community has a crime problem and *they* have to do something about it." The correct way to face this problem is to say, "We have a problem—all of us, black and white, have a crime problem—and *we* have to do something about it." But this tendency to polarize "we" versus "they" is facing us with a very alarming prospect, a serious danger to our future.

The black militants, of course, are guilty of the same kind of psychological distortion. They perceive the white population as unified and homogeneous; they even go to the extraordinary extreme, as many of you have already found, of saying that the real enemy is the white liberal, an extraordinary distortion from the point of view of those of us who have worked in this field.

Let me repeat: One of our basic problems is that of perception; all perceptions are subjective; you will never know the reality of the other person's problem. You can know only your own subjective states. I have a very good friend, a Detroit psychiatrist, who says, "I am the only Negro I shall ever know." He is a white psychiatrist, but says, "I am the only Negro I shall ever know," because what he knows are his perceptions, his images of other people. He speaks of "my Ross Stagner " to emphasize the fact that the Stagner he knows is not identical with the Stagner other people know. Each of us reacts to others differently. So your knowledge of external reality and social reality is determined by these perceptual processes. If time permitted, I would go into an elaborate discussion of the determinants of perception. I am just going to hit two or three high spots here, because I also want to talk about the problem of motivation and aggression. I see that my 2-hour speech is rapidly running over the 40 minutes that I am allotted for presenting it.

Labels

Let me talk about the importance of labels. Several years ago, during World War II to be exact, I was working in the personnel department of a large corporation. We desperately needed chemists. We were operating a lot of chemical plants for the Government, producing materials for the war. We were looking all over for chemists. One day I called an executive in the chemical division and told him that I had found a chemist with a master's degree from the University of Pittsburgh who was very well trained and an experienced person. He said, "That's wonderful. When can we hire him? Send him up so I can talk to him." I said, "There is one thing I must explain to you. He is Negro." He said, "What! Don't send him up here."

This was in the middle of a war when we desperately needed chemists. Here was a man who was well qualified and the executive would not even talk to him. As soon as he pinned the label Negro onto that particular person's education and job history, the executive changed his perception. He simply no longer perceived this person as a potential employee.

Tradition

Another influence on perception is the influence of tradition. We have traditions. We have cultural patterns. Bill Whyte, over here, knows more about cultural patterns than I do. But let me just tell you another little anecdote. Being a college professor has some advantages. You get around to see a lot of the world. Years ago I was visiting a petroleum refinery where one of the jobs open to Negroes had been mowing the lawn in front of the office with a hand lawnmower. When the company bought a power lawnmower, the union decided that this job had to be reclassified as a white job. Negroes could not be allowed to use power tools. The tradition that Negroes never handled power machinery in that particular establishment was sufficiently strong that the management had to reclassify the job.

Personal Experience

The importance of personal experience in determining perception is something which I would like to elaborate on. There are very few suburbanites who can appreciate the problem of rats in the inner city. I have a friend in Detroit who can. He was a graduate student at New York University back in the early fifties. He has a teenage daughter who occasionally still wakes up screaming in the middle of the night. She is having nightmares of rats running across her bed from the days when she was a baby in the New York area. The inner-city dweller has real experience with the problems of rats and garbage and things of that sort. But these are not real to the white suburbanite. He has no real experience of them. They have no compelling reality as far as he is concerned.

It is true that the suburbanite has problems. He loves to talk about his crabgrass, what a problem he has with his crabgrass. The slumdweller, of course, could not care less about the suburbanite's crabgrass. But the real trouble is that the suburbanite does not care about the inner-city garbage, rats, and problems of that sort. There is no compelling quality of reality here. So the behavior of the suburbanite is guided by his perception and the behavior of the inner-city individual is determined by his. This is where we get this "dialogue of the deaf" that Dr. Asch was talking about. One person talks about problems which are real to him. The other talks about his problems, what he sees as real, and never the twain shall meet. Each of them talks; nobody listens.

Motivation

Another important determinant of riot behavior is motivation, and this is what I really should have been talking about for the last 20 minutes. I promised that I would talk about "Psychological Dynamics of Inner-City Problems," and the dynamic aspect basically is motivation. On the other hand, it seems to me that this perceptual problem is so crucial to grasping the inner-city situation, to come to grips with it, that I simply had to stress it first.

Perceptions are frequently determined by motives. There are a great many whites who would like to believe, and who do sincerely

believe, that everything is all right if we just enforce the laws. All we have to do it to give our police force enough tanks, enough armored cars, enough bazookas, enough machine guns, and the inner city will quiet down. It might, at least temporarily. But why does a person see a thing that way? He prefers this kind of perception because then he will not have to change. Suppose you have a comfortable, privileged position in which your needs—starting with the physiological, food, clothing, and shelter, and progressing to security, belongingness, prestige, and self-actualization—are well satisfied. Most middle-class whites have that good fortune. Now if the white person can believe that he does not have to change, then he is not in danger of being asked to give up any of these gratifications. The motivation thus operates to favor this perception of the social situation as one in which no basic change is necessary, because that way he will not have to give up any of these privileges and satisfactions which are so pleasant to him.

Let me say just a few words more about this problem of motivation. As far as our research goes, the motives compelling human behavior are the same for all members of the human race. We do not need a special theory of motivation for whites, another for blacks, another for Orientals, or for whatever kinds of groups you want. There are differences in motives with respect to the particular kinds of goals that people strive for. Some people like soul food; others do not. Some people like a certain kind of home, certain kinds of living conditions. Dr. Asch found it very frustrating to move from Swarthmore to the larger metropolitan community of Princeton. He feels that this is much too big a town for him. The particular kinds of situations or goals that we seek in trying to satisfy our motives will vary, but the basic motivational pattern seems to be very much the same for all members of the human race.

The Aspiration Gap

The problem, however, with respect to our present social situation is basically the one that I have already outlined for you. That is, we hold up as a part of our culture certain kinds of goals which are alleged to be especially gratifying, especially desirable, and then we tell the individuals in certain groups, "You cannot have that."

Obviously, if you build up the expectation that this kind of goal is going to be attainable and then chop off that expectation, you create a very serious gap between what the individual desires and what he can achieve, what he can attain. This aspiration gap is a key to many of our inner-city hostilities.

Job Policies

I would like to say, incidentally, that we hold up this notion of jobs as one of the important components of this policy. Every man —and I suppose, according to some people at least, every woman— ought to have a job and our social policy should be directed toward providing these jobs and, I suppose, insisting that people take a job even if they don't want to. I don't think this is quite necessary. I am a little puzzled by some of the individuals who get so excited about the guaranteed annual income business. They say this is going to make people lazy and shiftless. "People should not be assured of their income and economic security, because they have to have this insecurity to be motivated." There are a number of people who come to mind. I think for a moment of Nelson Rockefeller, Robert F. Kennedy, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. They never had a useful job before they went into politics. They did not have to be motivated by economic insecurity and distress to work hard. They had a guaranteed income long before this idea was proposed as a matter of national policy. The English aristocracy give us a beautiful example of the fact that young people can be born with a high degree of income security and go on and do useful things. Of course, some of them turned out to be juvenile delinquents. Some of the European wars almost certainly were started by the idle hands of the aristocracy.

However, I think that most people probably would concede, on the whole, that there is no justification for the notion that a man has to have a job. What he requires is a *position* in which he can respect himself and be respected by other people. This is the crucial question, not a job in the sense of being productive. You don't have to go out there and work with automobiles on the assembly line. I would be a complete failure on an assembly line. So, obviously, I

323-899 O - 68 - 3

cannot tolerate this notion that the only way in which I can be useful is by working on that kind of a job.

What I am saying is that we need to approach this problem in terms of human motives. What are the motives? The motives involved here are the desire for self respect and the desire for the respect of other people. We can achieve that in many ways other than through productive employment.

Another problem that comes up here in connection with this employment business is the policy of a great many industrialists who feel that they must hire only the best person, only the one with the highest qualifications for a job. I have done a great deal of work on industrial psychology. I get the defense of this policy from many industrialists who say, "Well, any man we hire has to be a potential president of the company." This is a lot of nonsense. It's perfectly obvious that a very large percentage of the employees of this particular company are never going to get into the executive branch. Yet, these hiring policies deliberately choose individuals who are overqualified for the jobs. These people often sit there and work for a while, become frustrated and unhappy, and quit. It's not even intelligent policy from the point of view of the corporation. But it represents a stereotyped belief on the part of the industrialist that he must always hire the person with the highest qualifications.

I think we gradually are getting across to executives the notion that they need to hire a certain percentage of people who will be content to work in routine jobs. We must create the real possibility, and by real I mean perceptual, that children in the inner city will grow up with the perception that jobs, respect, status, and prestige can be achieved. We are doing some very interesting work at Wayne State with films in which we have been photographing successful Negroes—professional men, businessmen, artists, and others. We get pictures of them on the job, in the homes, and in recreational settings. We have been showing these in the high schools and junior high schools, and we are getting some very interesting results in terms of a change in the self-image of these adolescents. The youngsters are becoming convinced that something is possible, something can be achieved which is relevant in fitting into the society.

Frustration and Aggression

The last concept I wanted to speak to you about is frustration and its consequence, aggression. Let me say just a word about the problem of aggression. First of all, among professional psychologists there is virtual unanimity that there is no such thing as an instinct of aggression. We have discarded the concept of an instinct of pugnacity or any kind of a natural impulse to fight. People don't go to Vietnam because they have an impulse to fight; they go because they are drafted. The notion that aggression is an instinct is just completely unsupported by the evidence.

Aggression occurs because some motive has been blocked. The individual was trying to achieve something and this achievement was frustrated. He was blocked from getting satisfaction for his motives, so he became aggressive. You can see this very easily in young children. Give a child an ice cream cone, then take it away from him and you will get some aggression. You can see it very clearly. It's not an instinct; it's a reaction to a frustrated situation.

A distinguished psychologist, E. G. Howe, coined a phrase many years ago, that I rather liked, with reference to the developing war atmosphere in Europe. He said, "If there are mad dogs in Europe, it's not enough to cry for guns and chains. Who bit the dog, and why is he so mad?" This is relevant to our present inner-city situation. Who bit the dog, and why is he so mad? We do not simply clamp on the lid. We do not simply go in for police control and suppression. We must try to find out the root causes. What are the frustrations involved here and how can we correct these frustrations?

Displacement

Just a couple of final words. First, we get a tremendous amount of displacement of aggression. The individual may be frustrated by his boss. He does not dare attack his boss. He goes home and kicks his wife instead. Wives must be useful for something; displacement is one of these. A tremendous amount of inner-city crime is pure and simple displacement of aggression. Many inner-city Negroes are frustrated. They are blocked from achieving gratification. They

have a lot of tension built up. Some trivial incident occurs and they attack another person who really is not responsible for their frustrated state at all, but he is there and convenient. So you attack this handy object. Thus, most victims of Negro assault are other Negroes. You may also attack an individual from whom there is less danger of retaliation. The Nazis attacked the Jews in Germany because the Jews could not fight back. This is one of the reasons for displacement.

Projection

Second is the phenomenon of projection. If you are hostile, aggressive, if you feel angry, you are very likely to perceive the antagonist as evil, bad, violent, and dangerous. The drunk who goes into a bar and says, "Who is trying to start a fight with me?" will behave in such an obnoxious fashion that pretty soon somebody will start a fight with him. The projection of bad characteristics onto other people is another form of perceptual distortion.

Counter-Aggression

Third, aggression leads to counter-aggression. The white aggression against the Negro leads the Negro to fight back. The fighting back by the Negro leads to more aggression by the white. So you have a vicious escalation of aggression, hostility, and violence. We work with this kind of problem in somewhat less destructive psychological circumstances and find that we get far better results by removing threats, removing negative valences, or repressing forces than we do by increasing them. Theoretically, you can analyze the situation as follows: If you will think of a certain level of hostility, a certain level of violence, there are two ways to modify this level. You can reduce it by increasing the threat of punishment and the amount of pressure from above to push this level of violence down. Or you can reduce the level of violence by taking away the frustrating elements from below, which are tending to force the level of violence up. We find, in our practical work in the application of psychology in industry, that we get much better results if we take

away the negative forces from below than if we add negative forces above. So this is the approach that we tend to endorse. Those individuals who advocate the use of police force as a resolution of the inner-city problem are in about the position of the doctor who recommends that, because his patient has a high fever, you should pack him in ice. You will run the fever down all right, but you will probably kill the patient, too. Treatment by repressive measures is not only not therapeutic, it is actually destructive.

The problem of the inner city is then an economic problem, a sociological problem, and a political problem. It is also a psychological problem. The preferred solutions have already been proposed: jobs, housing, education. The approach I think my profession can contribute to is to say that if we can become as sensitive to the factors influencing our own perceptions, and the perceptions of other people, we can then take these intelligent, wisely conceived policies and put them into effect. If we can deal with the irrational factors which are blocking progress, these rational changes can be successfully introduced.

DISCUSSION PERIOD

DR. ASCH: The time has come for discussion.

FROM THE FLOOR: By showing films of successful Negroes in high schools, are you raising the expectations of the junior high school students on what they can achieve, thereby adding fuel to the rioting fire?

DR. STAGNER: Obviously, we do not perceive ourselves as doing that. You get some very curious reactions out of these youngsters. If you ask them before these films are shown, just catching them as ordinary junior high students, what kind of a career they want to go into, they will give you rather ridiculous answers. For example, here is a youngster who says he wants to be a heart transplant surgeon. You ask him, "Are you going to medical school?" and he just looks blank. It never occurred to him that there was some orderly sequence of planning of events that you went through in order to achieve this career.

The conclusion that we came to very quickly—I should not say we, because I really have not been directly involved in this thing—I am talking about John Teahan who is running this research, but I guess I get identified with the members of my faculty and assimilate their achievements to myself. What Teahan concluded was that the career expectations or career aspirations these young people expressed were pure fantasy. They had virtually no basis in a realistic evaluation of career lines which were open or of the steps that one took to achieve these. So when he would follow up this question by asking, "What do you think the chances are that you will someday become a heart transplant surgeon?" the typical answer would be zero. That is to say, the youngster had given him a very superficial, a very frivolous kind of answer—a career expectation which was not really an expectation at all.

The films attempt to communicate to these adolescents a notion not only that a certain career is realistically possible, but also that there is an orderly way of preparing yourself for this career. So the

responses and the answers after the films are shown indicate a much higher degree of realistic thinking about the problem than the interviews made before the film showing.

I think the answer is that we are probably not adding fuel to the flames. We think we are helping very confused adolescents to see, perceive, visualize that there are in fact careers open to them, and there are ways in which they can get into those career lines. If you got from one of these films an aspiration to be an IBM programer, let's say, and it turned out that you had absolutely no mathematical talent and had just flunked all of your program courses, I suppose some individuals would react to that by becoming more aggressive and more violent than before. Our impression so far has been that the effect has been quite otherwise than the one you are anticipating. The films have helped these young people to structure the job situation in a much more realistic fashion, and at the same time have given them hope. When you ask these questions about careers, and particularly after you begin to get some rapport with the youngster and get him to state his views clearly, you find that he did not really think any of these things were available. They were just fantasies. It was television stuff, you know. But he did not really think anybody—that is, anybody from his race—could achieve this. So we have given him a realistic hope in place of a fantasy daydream which he treated as a daydream and not as a real possibility.

FROM THE FLOOR: How do you help him in distinguishing what he can achieve and cannot achieve in society and what projects do you suggest to him?

DR. STAGNER: These adolescents are not going to take the lid off. But I guess I cannot go along with the notion that you advise these Negro teenagers to plan only for jobs which are available currently. That is one of the atrocious things that high school counselors do right now. They tell them to get a good course in broom handling or a good course in cooking or something of that sort, because "that is the only kind of a job you are going to be able to get." I think that is vicious.

We have tried to choose, obviously, as models for these films, Negroes who were, in fact, successful in technical and professional occupations. If you ask this particular child in what career he is going to be successful, then you have to go on to ability testing,

counseling, and tutoring. There is a whole array of psychological and educational techniques to be brought to bear on this particular question. But first you have to communicate in some fashion the notion that these careers really are open to Negroes. This, I think, has been one of the great problems in career counseling. A lot of these youngsters simply have not believed the equal opportunity ads and things of that sort. "It's for the birds." "It's a lot of nonsense." All too often it has been a lot of nonsense. So possibly we may be storing up trouble for industry and the professions 10 or 20 years from now, if these young people do get training, have the ability, get qualifications for these jobs, and then find the jobs are not open to them. Then I dare say there will be hell to pay. But basically, you see, I am assuming that somehow the white majority is going to come to its senses. Maybe I am too optimistic on this point.

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you have any ideas on how?

DR. STAGNER: Sure. Mr. Behlow, invite me back for the next four or five seminars. I will give you a thumbnail sketch. I just could not do it this afternoon. Dr. Asch just gave you a plug for my latest book, *Psychological Aspects of International Conflict* in which I did try to apply this same line of reasoning to international problems. But Secretary of State Rusk has not invited me down to give him advice. We do the best we can. We try to create these dialogues and if other people will not listen, we keep on talking.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am a little troubled by your emphasis on the subjective aspect of perception, almost to the extent that there is no reality out there. If you and I in the physical world disagreed about the length of that table, chances are we are not going to argue about it very much, because if we really want to determine how long it is, there are operations agreed upon to get our perceptions together and determine what is out there. If so many of the problems have to do with these different perceptions of social and psychological phenomena, does the psychologist have any sort of analogue to these operations performed on physical phenomena that might enable people to get their perceptions closer together, or does one have to seek a strategy in a totally different area, not working on the perception at all?

DR. STAGNER: Yes, we do have measurement operations, which perhaps are not nearly as precise as the operations of the physicist.

However, I call your attention to the fact that physicists don't have to agree on the nature of reality; all they have to agree on is the operation for measuring whatever it is out there. We have various kinds of techniques for finding out how these perceptions can be harmonized. We don't always succeed in harmonizing them. Let's be honest about that. But a great deal of the advance in psychological technology in the last 30 years has been directed precisely to that problem. Some of the techniques are the public opinion polls, the annual survey. George Katona's work on consumer expectations has proved to be a rather useful tool for the projection of economic trends. The opinion polls apparently underestimated McCarthy's vote in New Hampshire, but they are considerably more accurate than the journalistic practice of going around and asking half a dozen people what they expect in the way of an outcome of the election. We have considerably more sophisticated techniques, depth interviewing, projective tests, and things of that sort which are useful only in the hands of very experienced professionals.

But my answer would be, yes, we do have operations which can be brought to bear on the question as to what happened in Detroit last August. These are not going to resolve some of the differences, because some of the differences in perception are very rigidly held and simply are not amenable to discussion on an operational basis. You know the individual who says, "I have my mind made up. Don't confuse me with any facts." He would say, "I don't care what kinds of operations you use for this purpose, I am going to stick to my opinion."

I would not try to find any operations which would resolve the difference between individuals who believe that there is an innate difference in intelligence between Negroes and whites, and one who says the differences are environmentally determined. There simply are no operations available at the present time which would resolve that particular dispute. Somebody reads the evidence this way, and you read it the other way, and there is not much you can do about it. But I think we are making progress in developing the kinds of operations that you refer to, and we hope that we shall continue to improve in that particular respect. This is a basic philosophical question. We are not going to answer the question, "What is the nature of reality?" We are going to answer the question, "How do these perceptions happen to be different, and to

what extent can we increase the proportion of agreement by resorting to operational definition?"

FROM THE FLOOR: The topic of your talk is "Psychological Dynamics of Inner-City Problems." One meaning of dynamics relates to change and it seems to me that the psychology of perception is very good to explain the statics of inner-city problems, but not so much the dynamics in that these perceptual problems, characteristics, or psychological states are constants, rather than variables. The lack of understanding you talk about, inability to empathize with another person, is not the lack of communication which is in a sense existential. It's just over a long period of time that we have noticed changes which have been rather rapid in recent years, such as the increase in riots, and the like. How do you relate this to something that seems rather static? You don't explain the rise and fall of the social classes, change in social systems, or the rise of one nation in terms of things like psychological perception.

DR. STAGNER: You challenged me when you put that last sentence in there. I was going to go along with you until we got to that point. You will have to read my book on international conflict. You will find there some arguments which do suggest that psychological factors influence the rise and fall of nations. Our State Department is firmly convinced that psychological factors have no relevance to these events. But I think, for example, that the way the North Vietnamese perceive the situation has a tremendous lot to do with the difficulties we are encountering; their motivations and their emotions are very relevant. So I would say in answering your last question first that I could not disagree with you more. I think that these psychological variables are tremendously important for nations, classes, and cities, as well as State and Federal relationships. As far as feuding between Government bureaus, read Schlesinger on some of the feuding between C.I.A. and Defense, for example. You find some very large egos trying to get bigger. The aggrandizement of the individual bureaucrat's ego is a factor of no small importance in world affairs.

Now, to go back to your real question, I think it was a very important question, how do you move from a static to a dynamic analysis? Every dynamic analysis takes off from a static base. You must have a base. Motives are the dynamic factors. Somebody, I can't remember who it was, coined a phrase that I like particularly

well. He said, "The real dynamic forces in history are human motives." When you stop and think about it, this must be true. It cannot be anything else.

You are, I think, justified in criticizing my presentation here in the sense that I slipped in under false pretenses. I said I was going to talk about dynamics and I got so wrapped up in the problems of perception that I did not say very much about motives. I will be glad to give you a 45-minute lecture on the subject of motivation and how it's relevant to this problem, in the next 35 minutes. But basically what I would say is this: The motives of the members of the white majority are at the present moment threatened with deprivation and frustration caused by the situations which we have created in our cities. If we correctly analyze the perceptual problems with which we are faced, then the efforts of the members of the white majority to protect their situation—and I mean protect in the long-run sense, not in the immediate short-run sense—may lead them to bring about changes of the kind that the Kerner Commission and these other commissions have recommended. But we must also see the motives of Negroes and arrange satisfactions to be available for them.

I am, as Dr. Asch knows, a firm believer in homeostatic theory, which is a fancy way of saying that I believe human behavior tends towards equilibrium. However, when an equilibrium is disturbed, a person does not necessarily try to go back to the equilibrium that was just disturbed. He may try to achieve a new and more stable equilibrium. (This is where I get in a hassle with some of my professional colleagues who cannot understand what I mean by homeostasis.) But that is just the problem of perception again. You don't perceive the same way I do. Essentially, my answer to your question then is: The dynamics of the inner-city problem involves an analysis of the motives of the various groups within the white majority. Just as I stressed that Negroes are not a unified group to be treated as "they," so I reject the notion that the white majority is a unified group to be treated as "we." There are various perceptions and various definitions of the problem. But if we analyze the motives of these various groups and if the members of these groups can be induced to adopt a more realistic perception of the situation, then I think the motives will be expressed in action which will bring about the change we are talking about. This is a very

brief answer compared to what I would like to give you. But that is the best I can do under these circumstances.

FROM THE FLOOR: I would like to introduce my question with a brief ancedote. At the beginning of World War I, a delegation of nations offered to Newton Baker, the then Secretary of War, the services of their nations' chemists in the war effort. Mr. Baker thanked them and in a few days wrote back a very courteous "thank you" note for the offer, but said that the War Department already had a chemist. My colleages in the Department of Labor advise me that the Manpower Administration also has a psychologist. The question I have is in the context of the particular range of issues in the Manpower Administration, problems they have dealing with housing, jobs, and education. Do you, Dr. Asch, or some eminent members of your profession, believe that more or different things should be done? I know this is going to take five more lectures, but do you have any reactions at all as to the thrust of some of these programs from the standpoint of your discipline?

DR. STAGNER: By "the thrust of some of these programs," you mean how are they operating at the present moment?

FROM THE FLOOR: What you might have done differently.

DR. STAGNER: I am participating tomorrow in a research committee meeting on things I think ought to be done. My offhand answer to your question would be, certainly there are many things that the Manpower Administration is doing which are quite good and I am sure have been effective. I would suggest they might be more effective if some of these points were taken into consideration. I used the example a few minutes ago of how the inhabitants of the inner city perceived the Employment Service office, as an example of a researchable problem which might lead to data which would be of considerable value in improving the efficiency of the service in this particular situation.

There are all kinds of things that come to mind here. I'll answer your ancedote with another one. A friend of mine is a high official on the Detroit Board of Education in the school system of Detroit. He tells me that he was rather shocked when he got into this public school situation. He got out of a university professorship into public schools to find how little credence could be placed in the results of certain kinds of testing. I mentioned a little while ago the question of the Negro-white differences in terms of intelligence. He says

that the typical behavior of a school teacher in one of these "predominately Negro schools" is to take some standarized tests and hand them out to the kids and say, "Here, fill these out and give them back to me." This just makes the hair of a professional psychologist curl up, because there are very carefully prescribed instructions. There are sample problems to be worked out. There is an opportunity for the kids who are being tested to ask if they are doing correctly, and there is an opportunity for the teacher to check and see if the answer is being correctly marked. The teachers are so convinced that these kids are going to flunk the tests that they don't even bother to read the instructions to them.

I am sure that the Employment Service testing program is conducted on a somewhat higher level than that. But I would say that one of the areas in which many of us believe the work of the Employment Service could be improved is in that of ability testing, counseling, planning, corrective education, and other kinds of programs for helping the individual adjust to this employment situation. I have great confidence that psychology could be of more use to you than it is at the present time. I have to be honest and say that the profession has only in fairly recent years addressed itself in a consistent and vigorous manner to some of these problems. I still feel that too many of my colleagues are wrapped up in the psychology of the white rat, to the detriment of the white-Negro problems. But I do believe we have a great deal more in the way of expertise than is being utilized by government at the present time. So I hope we shall infiltrate further and make our contributions to this kind of problem.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not deprecating in any way the work of the economists, sociologists, and educators. I started my remarks by saying that I think the policy recommendations of the Kerner Commission and other commissions concerned in this area are psychologically sound. The psychological deficiency is in the area of execution. The policy recommendations are good. What we want, if I may coin a phrase, is a task force, which would be composed of people from various disciplines who might work on the implementation of these procedures in the Manpower Administration and elsewhere.

FROM THE FLOOR: You mentioned earlier the use of the news media and public opinion in getting across the message. It seems to

me very much that here you are talking about psychology as directed to the Negro people in the ghettos, rather than as directed to the white people of the country. I think many people have brought this up in different ways. It seems that they are the ones who are not perceiving correctly and that all the other psychological tools that could be used for the people in the ghetto are not of much use unless the white people have been affected. Do you have any ideas as to how the opinion makers, the advertising media, and that kind of thing, could be used to affect white opinion, ways of perceiving?

DR. STAGNER: First of all, if I seemed to be saying at any time that I thought the solution to this problem rested with the Negro population, I certainly did not intend to say that. I thought I was saying very emphatically that the crucial problem is the white majority. It's not the Negro population. This ridiculous notion that you study the riots by interviewing the people who riot is absurd and irrelevant. It's not irrelevant, it's just absurd. The question that you ask has to be preceded by another question. How do we get the opinion leaders to start this program of educating the white majority, and what other techniques do we use in implementing this program? I am not advocating that we try to fool the public, because I am deeply convinced that this is not a matter of trying to create another set of perceptual distortions. I think it is a matter of trying to improve the clarity and accuracy of our perceptions of these social problems.

On the other hand, I think we have to use Madison Avenue techniques. We have to use opinions, influencing devices of every kind. Let me tell you of another interesting experience. I was on a Ford Foundation Fellowship, studying decision making in corporations. I ran into one corporation, where a friend of mine in the personnel department had been trying for years to get the executives to hire Negro secretaries and Negro stenographers. They would interview them. They had this big, "Plans For Progress" sign on the wall, "Equal Employment Opportunity Employer," and so forth. But the executive would always find something wrong with the girl and turn her down. Then President Johnson invited a group of industrialists to the White House, including the president of this corporation, which was a rather large one, and they had a big fiesta. They had lunch at the White House, and they signed a very impos-

ing-looking document saying, "We are going to improve equal employment opportunities." Anyway, the corporation president came back and announced to the staff, "From now on we are going to hire Negro white-collar people," and they did. Putting a placard on the wall didn't mean anything, but when the top executive of the company decides that something is going to be done, you begin to get action.

So I think we have to make use of opinion leaders, people in a position of power, people who have control of employment opportunities, and things of that sort. We also have to employ progaganda techniques, if you will. Propaganda is a nasty word but basically what we have to do here is to change the way of perceiving the situation which has been enshrined in our culture through a long period of time. It's going to take a while. That is why I pessimistically said that the riot commission of 1969 will report on the '68 riots, and the '70 commission will report on the '69 riots. We do not make these changes quickly. Sometimes I wish we had techniques for making these changes quickly. Then when I think about the ways in which such methods can be misused, I get qualms about it. But at the present time the psychologists do not have a magic formula for changing this majority culture overnight. It's going to be a slow process. It's going to take a lot of effort. I guess those of us who believe in it will go on banging our heads against this particular brick wall until we knock it down.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am wondering if you will make much progress resolving these tensions as long as you perceive the behavior of workers as being irrational. You are dealing with people who have competition for jobs. The differential in skill in many of these jobs is very slight. The individual guy on the job fights against the entry of Negroes into his union, or whatever the case may be. He is not being irrational, even in the long terms. If you oversimplify this thing too much I think you might not get too much progress.

DR. STAGNER: I think I would say first that the charge of irrationality is much more appropriately leveled at the suburbanite than it is at the working-class white. But I would not entirely agree with you about the long-range rationality of the working-class white. We know that the craft unions back in the 1920's refused to have anything to do with mass-production workers. You are probably old enough to remember the formation of the CIO in 1935. The drive

to organize the mass-production workers was done almost over the dead bodies of some of the old AFL bureaucrats who were firmly convinced that it was irrational, from their point of view. It was irrational from the point of view of the welfare of the craft unions to organize mass-production workers. I think if you took a poll today you would find that their opinions have changed very drastically.

The long-range interests of the white worker are increasing the prosperity of the United States as a whole. This is one of the major considerations we have not succeeded in getting across to many white workers. He also has a long-range interest in domestic tranquility. He might have an interest in not having his house burned out. He would certainly have an interest in not having to pay a drastically higher tax rate for police services and calling out the National Guard every so often. It's an expensive business, calling out the National Guard. If you would analyze the economic implications of prejudice and discrimination, you can make a pretty convincing case, except that most economists cannot talk the language that the average worker can understand. (A lot of economic theory I characterize as discussing how many angels can dance on the point of the gross national product.) I am not talking about excluding economics, but economic theorists have gotten so abstract I don't think they could communicate to the working-class population. To get back to your question, I just cannot accept your notion that the white worker is being rational in the long run. He is being rational in the short-run sense, I'll concede that. But I will not at this moment accept the notion that he is being rational in the long-run situation.

FROM THE FLOOR: I don't think he is, either, but he thinks he is. He is not irrational within his own framework.

DR. STAGNER: That is what I started with. I said that all of us are guided by our perceptions and to me my perception is the only reality. I cannot accept the reality of what other people perceive. This is what I was talking ad nauseam about, this particular problem—that each of us tends to perceive his behavior as rational because he defines reality in such a way that he is behaving rationally. To change that behavior you have to change his perception of the situation.

FROM THE FLOOR: I was very interested in one of your opening

remarks where you said experts agree on the solution to these problems like more jobs, better housing, and so on. This has always been the case throughout history. The cry has always been for more. This is aspiration. The point here is if somebody does not have a job and then he finally gets one, the next step in the aspiration process is to get a better one. So in a sense these are aspirations common to all of us. But I do not think these are exclusions, because exclusions seem to lie in the means of getting from one place to another. Do you have any mechanism or any means to move from one place to another, from aspirations to reality? Because I think that even if we achieve better jobs and better housing for everybody, we would still have so many of these problems.

DR. STAGNER: Well, I would not want to try to blueprint a lot of proposals that belong to other specialties—economics, for example (not the economic theorists); but the practical economist can say a lot more than I can with regard to some of these questions. Some of these programs are going on at the present time, in which inner-city employers, urban employers, are being urged to hire people out of the ghetto without psychological testing, without a check on the police records, without a high school diploma, without a lot of the paraphernalia which they have insisted upon in the past. (And I should point out that psychological research has indicated that these qualifications have very little to do with success on the job. So they are not really giving away anything by changing this hiring procedure.)

The policy recommendations are for increases in jobs, increases in the number of people employed. The Kerner Commission, as I understand its report, does not say that people have to have jobs. That is not a policy. That is just a pious statement that I am in favor of motherhood. The recommendation is to industrialists to get out there and hire some more of these people and get them out of the ghetto and into regular productive employment. The criticism I would offer with respect to the program so far as I have gotten any details of it—and I have not read the report, just a summary—is that the aspirations are much too modest. They are talking about the need for 500,000 new jobs within the next 2 or 3 years. Actually, you need over 1 million new jobs a year just to keep up with the growth in the population. I would say that the recommendations are in the right direction. We have to have more

people employed. But quantitatively they were deficient because the members of the Commission did not have the courage to set the aspiration levels as high as they need to be.

The housing goal was something like 500,000 over the next 3 years, while there are almost 1 million new household units formed by marriage every year. Where are you going to put all those people? You have to have housing units for them. Of course, a certain number of people die off, but that is not enough to solve this housing shortage. So I would say the economists have told us something about how we can go about getting more jobs, integrating these people into the economy, but they simply have been too modest in setting their aspiration levels with respect to the number of jobs, the number of houses, and so forth, that are required.

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you suppose the problem is really a class problem, not a race problem, in light of the fact that 80 percent of the poor people, 80 percent of the unemployed, are white people? Don't you think it's more of a problem of poor people, rather than the problem of Negro people versus white?

DR. STAGNER: There is certainly a mixture of the two problems. Your figures are a little wrong. The percentage of unemployed is much greater among blacks. You will have to argue that out with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

FROM THE FLOOR: Eighty percent of the unemployed are white and not Negro?

DR. STAGNER: It just does not agree with what I have been reading. Is there an expert in the crowd?

FROM THE FLOOR: The gross number is, not percentages. You see, there are more whites in the population.

FROM THE FLOOR: I said 80 percent of the poor people and 80 percent of the unemployed are white people.

DR. STAGNER: I'm sorry. I must have misunderstood the first part of your statement. It is obviously true that 80 percent of the unemployed are white. It is not true that 80 percent of the employed are white. It's nearer 90 percent. This is the discrepancy I was thinking about.

To go back to your basic question, is it a class problem or a race problem? I think if you look at the income gap you can see that race is definitely involved in the problem. It's not just a class problem, although many of the things I am talking about were class is-

sues before they were race issues. Dr. Whyte, over here, knows that last year the Industrial Relations Research Association had a special program on the parallels between industrial conflict in the 1930's and race conflicts in the 1960's. Many of the issues, from a psychologist's point of view, are identical. We had the same allegations—violence, illegal action. Remember the sitdown strikes. Management said, "We will not change. All we want is police protection. Put on the lid." I was teaching an evening class at the University of Akron that year. There were a couple of nice, old, gray-haired school teachers who sat down in the front row of this class. I came in one evening while they were chatting. One of them said, "They ought to take machine guns out and mow down those guys on the picket line." Nice, gentle old ladies. They looked like somebody's mother.

The psychological problems, the rigidity of management at that time, the refusal to accept the right of unions to negotiate, the hostility of the general public, and the use of illegal tactics by unions were very closely parallel to the psychological situation we now have, only it's now focused primarily on the race issue and not on unionization as such. I would agree there is a class factor involved, but I think the psychological focus has gotten into the race issue.

FROM THE FLOOR: I think there is a general feeling among a lot of white people that there is a general instability among the Negro population, be it wrong or right, as far as perception, in terms of family, marriage, and so forth. I get the feeling that perhaps part of the reaction toward what has happened in the inner cities on the part of the white community is a further extension of moral ineptitude or just lack of morality that exists in the Negro community. I am wondering, in terms of jobs, whether you have found in your research any evidence that such instability does exist. I know that sociologists have found there is a measure of family instability among the Negro communities. I am not assigning any blame to this. I am not talking about blame or causes right now. Is there any interrelationship between getting a job and showing up the instability in the Negro family structure?

DR. STAGNER: There is a very real connection between getting a job and having a stable family situation. The operation of our welfare system is such that if a man cannot get a job his family is better

off if he leaves home. So if we provided jobs for these young Negro males, jobs which gave them an opportunity for respect and an opportunity to earn enough income to maintain their families at even a reasonable approximation of the style they would like their families to become accustomed to, we would increase the stability of the Negro family enormously. I don't think there is any question about it.

On the other hand, you are going to have a certain amount of instability. There is instability among Hollywood marriages which are not suffering from a poverty problem. You are not going to get rid of all family instability by providing people with jobs. But I think we must recognize the fact that these issues are interrelated and that the proposal for an increased number of jobs for Negro males, an increased effort to recruit them into the industrial work force, and efforts to help them get adjusted will pay off.

Dr. Whyte asked me about psychological technology a while ago. We have a project going with a Detroit firm now in which we are virtually giving psychotherapy to a lot of new ghetto hires. We are trying to help them resolve their probems of insecurity, anxiety, and hostility, which prevent a lot of slum-dwellers from adapting to an industrial job situation. I think there are all sorts of things that we may be able to do. We somehow have to mobilize the professional staff efforts, and above all, the financial resources to apply these techniques to the solution of these problems. Here we go back to the white majority and the fact that if the white majority refuses to vote the money for the furtherance of these kinds of programs, I think we are simply saying that the white majority is behaving in a suicidal fashion. It's cutting its own throat. If you cut somebody else's throat, you may be cutting your own sometimes. I think this is the problem you are faced with. But we have not succeeded in communicating this message successfully to the people involved. So I would say then that all of these things are interrelated. The instability of the Negro family contributes to some extent to the difficulty these people have in adjusting to an industrial job, and their failure to get jobs contributes to the instability of the family. So it's an escalating spiral again.

MR. MIRENGOFF: This is the final moment. The discussion of perception was fascinating to me. I was trying to recall the story I heard a long time ago about two youngsters who grew up as chil-

dren in Manchester, England, both very able, both very ambitious, and both very competitive. Although their careers went in different directions—one to the navy, the other to the ministry—they followed each other's careers very closely with a great deal of competitive interest. Finally, one became a bishop in the Anglican church and the other an admiral in Her Majesty's Navy. They met many years later in a railroad station in London. The bishop perceived the admiral first. He walked up to him, poked his finger in the middle of his awards and ribbons and decorations and said, "Stationmaster, when does the next train leave for Tarkington?"

The admiral, without batting an eye, looked at the bishop—a large, corpulent man in black flowing robes—poked his finger at His Eminence, and said, "Madam, the train leaves in 10 minutes, but should you be traveling in your condition?" These, I guess, are aspects of perception.

I do want to thank Dr. Stagner and Dr. Asch for a very meaningful meeting and decisive presentation. Thank you for sharpening the issues.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1968 O - 323-899

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Copies of this publication or additional information on manpower programs and activities may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D.C. Publications on manpower are also available from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
1015 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1240 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44199
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
19th and Stout Street, Denver, Colorado 80202
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104